

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADIL K HIRAMANNEK, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-00228-RMW

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM NON-DISPOSITIVE
PRETRIAL ORDER OF MAGISTRATE
JUDGE (DKT. NO. 261)**

Re: Dkt. No. 266

On September 4, 2015, Plaintiff Adil HirananeK filed a “Motion for Relief from Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge *and* Motion for De Novo Determination.”¹ Dkt. No. 266. Plaintiff’s motion objects to the magistrate judge’s order, Dkt. No. 261, granting defendants Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, and Beth Miller’s motion, Dkt. No. 258, for leave to file a supplemental declaration in support of their opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to compel.

After Plaintiff filed a reply in support of his motion to compel, Defendants sought court approval to file the declaration on August 26, 2015. Dkt. No. 258. The magistrate judge granted approval on September 1, 2015. Dkt. No. 261. Defendants filed the declaration on September 2, 2015. Dkt. No. 262. This procedure complied with Civil Local Rule 7-3(d). “Once a reply is filed,

¹ As stated in the court’s prior orders, the parties are not entitled to de novo determination of discovery orders by the magistrate judge. Dkt. No. 280 at 2.

no additional memoranda, papers or letters may be filed *without prior Court approval*, except” in circumstances that the rule describes. *Id.* (emphasis added). The court finds no portion of the magistrate judge’s order that is “clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

The magistrate judge’s order is **AFFIRMED**.

Dated: September 25, 2015



Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California